



**University of  
Zurich<sup>UZH</sup>**

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2019

---

## **Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after bariatric surgery—outcomes of six consecutive cases in a single institution**

Morell, Bernhard ; Murray, Fritz ; Vetter, Diana ; Bueter, Marco ; Gubler, Christoph

**Abstract:** Purpose Anastomotic leakages or staple line defects after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) and primary laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG), respectively, with consecutive bariatric revisional surgery are associated with relevant morbidity and mortality rates. Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) with or without stent-over-sponge (SOS) has been shown to be a promising therapy in foregut wall defects of various etiologies and may therefore be applied in the treatment of postbariatric leaks. Methods We report the results of six consecutive patients treated with EVT (83% in combination with SOS) for early postoperative leakages in close proximity to the esophagogastric junction (EGJ) after LSG (n = 2) and RYGB (n = 4) from May 2016 to May 2018. Results All patients (2/6 male, median age 51 years, median BMI 44.2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) were treated successfully without further signs of persisting leakage at the last gastroscopy. The lesions' size ranged from 0.5 cm<sup>2</sup> to 9 cm<sup>2</sup>, and the leaks were connected to large (max. 225 cm<sup>2</sup>) abscess cavities in 80% of the cases. Median duration of treatment (= EVT in situ) was 23.5 days (range, 7–89). The number of endoscopic interventions ranged from 1 to 24 (median, n = 7), with a median duration between vacuum sponge replacements of 4 days. Conclusion EVT is an effective and safe treatment for staple line defects or anastomotic leakage after bariatric surgeries and can therefore be adopted for the treatment of midgut wall defects. Further studies with a greater number of patients comparing surgical drainage alone or in combination with EVT versus EVT alone are needed.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-019-01750-9>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-165766>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Morell, Bernhard; Murray, Fritz; Vetter, Diana; Bueter, Marco; Gubler, Christoph (2019). Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after bariatric surgery—outcomes of six consecutive cases in a single institution. *Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery*, 404(1):115-121.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-019-01750-9>

# Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery

## Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after Bariatric Surgery – outcomes of 6 consecutive cases in a single institution --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	LAOS-D-18-00390R1
<b>Full Title:</b>	Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after Bariatric Surgery – outcomes of 6 consecutive cases in a single institution
<b>Article Type:</b>	How-I-Do-It articles
<b>Section/Category:</b>	Abdominal Surgery
<b>Keywords:</b>	Endoscopic vacuum therapy, stent-over-sponge, laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, anastomotic leakage, SEMS
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Christoph Gubler University Hospital Zurich Zurich, SWITZERLAND
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	University Hospital Zurich
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Bernhard Morell
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Bernhard Morell Fritz Murray Diana Vetter Marco Bueter Christoph Gubler
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Anastomotic leakages or staple line defects after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) and primary laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG), respectively, with consecutive bariatric revisional surgery are associated with relevant morbidity and mortality rates. Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) with or without stent-over-sponge (SOS) has been shown to be a promising therapy in foregut wall defects of various etiologies and may therefore be applied in the treatment of postbariatric leaks.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b></p> <p>We report the results of 6 consecutive patients treated with EVT (83% in combination with SOS) for early postoperative leakages in close proximity to the esophagogastric junction (EGJ) after LSG (n=2) and RYGB (n=4) from 05/2016 to 05/2018.</p> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <p>All patients (2/6 male, median age 51 years, median BMI 44.2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) were treated successfully without further signs of persisting leakage at the last gastroscopy. The lesions' size ranged from 0,5 cm<sup>2</sup> to 9 cm<sup>2</sup> and the leaks were connected to large (max. 225 cm<sup>2</sup>) abscess cavities in 80% of the cases. Median duration of treatment (=EVT in situ) was 23.5 days (range, 7-89). The number of endoscopic interventions</p>

ranged from 1 to 24 (median, n=7), with a median duration between vacuum sponge replacements of 4 days.

Conclusion:

EVT is an effective and safe treatment for staple line defects or anastomotic leakage after bariatric surgeries and can therefore be adopted for the treatment of midgut wall defects. Further studies with a greater a number of patients comparing surgical drainage alone or in combination with EVT versus EVT alone are needed.

# Please wait...

If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document.

You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows®, Mac, or Linux® by visiting [http://www.adobe.com/go/reader\\_download](http://www.adobe.com/go/reader_download).

For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acrreader>.

Windows is either a registered trademark or a trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries. Mac is a trademark of Apple Inc., registered in the United States and other countries. Linux is the registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the U.S. and other countries.

# Please wait...

If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document.

You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows®, Mac, or Linux® by visiting [http://www.adobe.com/go/reader\\_download](http://www.adobe.com/go/reader_download).

For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acrreader>.

Windows is either a registered trademark or a trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries. Mac is a trademark of Apple Inc., registered in the United States and other countries. Linux is the registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the U.S. and other countries.

# Please wait...

If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document.

You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows®, Mac, or Linux® by visiting [http://www.adobe.com/go/reader\\_download](http://www.adobe.com/go/reader_download).

For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acrreader>.

Windows is either a registered trademark or a trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries. Mac is a trademark of Apple Inc., registered in the United States and other countries. Linux is the registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the U.S. and other countries.

# Please wait...

If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document.

You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows®, Mac, or Linux® by visiting [http://www.adobe.com/go/reader\\_download](http://www.adobe.com/go/reader_download).

For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acrreader>.

Windows is either a registered trademark or a trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries. Mac is a trademark of Apple Inc., registered in the United States and other countries. Linux is the registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the U.S. and other countries.

# Please wait...

If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document.

You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows®, Mac, or Linux® by visiting [http://www.adobe.com/go/reader\\_download](http://www.adobe.com/go/reader_download).

For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acrreader>.

Windows is either a registered trademark or a trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries. Mac is a trademark of Apple Inc., registered in the United States and other countries. Linux is the registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the U.S. and other countries.



Figure 1




Figure 2









Figure 3



## Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after Bariatric Surgery – outcomes of 6 consecutive cases in a single institution

Ref.: Ms. No. LAOS-D-18-00390

### Point-by-point responses to reviewers' comments

Dear Prof. Büchler

Thank you very much for your email dated November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

I am happy to resubmit the manuscript titled “Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after Bariatric Surgery – outcomes of 6 consecutive cases in a single institution” (Ms. No. LAOS-D-18-00390) after a thorough revision in accordance to the provided reviewers' comments.

I hereby provide you with point-by-point responses to all comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me any time, if you are having further comments or questions.

Yours sincerely,

Christoph Gubler

### Point-by-point responses:

#### Reviewer #2:

**1: The *expenses of this therapy*: both EndoVac and especially the stents are very expensive and using both at the same time would most likely be prohibitive in most health care systems of the world.**

Thank you for this important comment. We do agree that expenditures caused by repeated endoscopies are a major concern. We therefore added a section in the discussion of the manuscript, including both, references and an example of approximate costs. In our opinion, the evaluation of new treatment modalities appears to be justified in this vulnerable patient cohort, since treatment failure may result in prolonged hospital stays, which generate additional costs, or worse, in death of the patient. However further studies are definitely needed.

**2: I would like that the authors discuss the *benefits of the additional EndoVac on top of the stent* since there have been severely studies been published in the last months showing that stent therapy is a good solution. This has also relevance in that regard that patients with a stent can be handled in an outpatient setting if the infection is under control whereas the EndoVac requires hospitalization.**

In accordance to our response to the reviewers' first comment, we added both, references and our personal rationale concerning the potential advantages of additional EVT on top to stent placements in the discussion section of the manuscript. We do agree that the use of the SOS-principle has to be evaluated carefully for each individual patient. In our opinion, the SOS-principle is of advantage in patients requiring aggressive treatment, e.g. in critically ill patients with large defects resulting in a high risk of sponge displacements.

**3: The discussion about *prophylactic EndoVac* therapy is in my opinion out of place. The authors provide no data whatsoever on the prophylactic use. Just because they started doing that in esophagectomy does not warrant this statement in this manuscript, especially since the available data on prophylactic EndoVac is not that convincing.**

The referred section has been taken out of the manuscript.

**4: Please discuss the *differences between sleeve and RYGB in case of a leak*. The sleeve leak is usually at the angle of His and due to the tube of the sleeve, it is a high pressure system which makes**

*all the differences. The long stents bridging the pylorus are usually most effective to decrease the pressure in the gastric sleeve. This is very different in the RYGB leak which has no pressure in the pouch.*

Thank you for this important comment. Please find additional information in the discussion section.

**Reviewer #3:**

**1:** *In 5/6 patients the authors **combined an EVT therapy with endoscopic stenting**. Unless they described this method before all other authors dealing with anastomotic leakage use EVT alone. I guess that the outcome of their patients would be the same without combining with SEMS because all other parameters (number of exchanges, etc) are similar to the reported data concerning EVT alone.*

This comment is very similar to comment 2 of reviewer #2. Please find our answer above.

**2:** *Furthermore **SEMS is an expensive therapy** and the authors report on one patient having 16 times SEMS implantation. So to my opinion it is necessary to add an further sentence in the discussion dealing with this issue, explaining the idea, presenting the costs and pondering potential benefits against cost and risks.*

Thank you for this comment. Please see our response to comments 1 and 2 of reviewer #2.

**3:** *For SOS technique a partially **covered SEMS** was used. In one patient an esophageal wall stripping occurred during extraction of the SEMS, which is a well known complication of partially covered SEMS. Why didn't the authors use fully covered SEMS?*

Thank you for this important comment. The rationale to use partially covered SEMS was the smaller risk of stent migrations. Nonetheless, SEMS migration occurred in one patient. This information was added to the manuscript.

**4:** *The authors state, that the median number of days between diagnosis of anastomotic leakage and beginning of EVT was 2.5 days. **Why did the therapy not start immediately?***

Four out of six patients were referred from other hospitals before treatment was started in our institution. In an additional patient EVT was applied after a previous treatment with SEMS over a period of 7 days did not result in a clinical improvement. This information was added to the discussion section.

**5:** *The **hospital and IMC/ICU stay** should be mentioned for all patients.*

We added this information to table 1.

# Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT) for early infradiaphragmal leakage after Bariatric Surgery – outcomes of 6 consecutive cases in a single institution

**Short title:** EVT for post-bariatric leakage

## Authors

<sup>1</sup> Bernhard Morell, MD; Email: [bernhard.morell@usz.ch](mailto:bernhard.morell@usz.ch); Orcid-ID: 0000-0002-8507-0619

<sup>1</sup> Fritz Murray, MD; Email: [fritz.murray@usz.ch](mailto:fritz.murray@usz.ch); Orcid-ID: 0000-0002-7381-780X

<sup>2</sup> Diana Vetter, MD; Email: [diana.vetter@usz.ch](mailto:diana.vetter@usz.ch)

<sup>2</sup> Marco Bueter, MD; Email: [marco.bueter@usz.ch](mailto:marco.bueter@usz.ch); Orcid-ID: 0000-0002-1391-0842

<sup>1</sup> Christoph Gubler, MD; Email: [christoph.gubler@usz.ch](mailto:christoph.gubler@usz.ch); Orcid-ID: 0000-0002-0426-8069

<sup>1</sup>Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University Hospital Zurich, Raemistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland; <sup>2</sup>Division of Surgery and Transplantation, University Hospital Zurich, Raemistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland

## Correspondence to:

Christoph Gubler, MD  
Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland  
Raemistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland  
Email: [christoph.gubler@usz.ch](mailto:christoph.gubler@usz.ch)  
Phone: +41 44 255 1111

## Abbreviations:

LSG laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy

RYGB Roux-en-Y gastric bypass

GI gastrointestinal

SEMS self-expandable metal stent

EVT endoscopic vacuum therapy

SOS stent-over-sponge

EGJ esophagogastric junction

CT computed tomography

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Purpose:**

Anastomotic leakages or staple line defects after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) and primary laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG), respectively, with consecutive bariatric revisional surgery are associated with relevant morbidity and mortality rates. Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) with or without stent-over-sponge (SOS) has been shown to be a promising therapy in foregut wall defects of various etiologies and may therefore be applied in the treatment of postbariatric leaks.

### **Methods:**

We report the results of 6 consecutive patients treated with EVT (83% in combination with SOS) for early postoperative leakages in close proximity to the esophagogastric junction (EGJ) after LSG (n=2) and RYGB (n=4) from 05/2016 to 05/2018.

### **Results:**

All patients (2/6 male, median age 51 years, median BMI 44.2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) were treated successfully without further signs of persisting leakage at the last gastroscopy. The lesions' size ranged from 0,5 cm<sup>2</sup> to 9 cm<sup>2</sup> and the leaks were connected to large (max. 225 cm<sup>2</sup>) abscess cavities in 80% of the cases. Median duration of treatment (=EVT in situ) was 23.5 days (range, 7-89). The number of endoscopic interventions ranged from 1 to 24 (median, n=7), with a median duration between vacuum sponge replacements of 4 days.

### **Conclusion:**

EVT is an effective and safe treatment for staple line defects or anastomotic leakage after bariatric surgeries and can therefore be adopted for the treatment of midgut wall defects. Further studies with a greater number of patients comparing surgical drainage alone or in combination with EVT versus EVT alone are needed.

**Keywords:** Endoscopic vacuum therapy, stent-over-sponge, laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, anastomotic leakage, SEMS

**Authors' contributions:**

Study concept and design: Bernhard Morell, Fritz Murray, Christoph Gubler

Acquisition of data: Bernhard Morell, Fritz Murray, Marco Bueter

Analysis and interpretation of data: Bernhard Morell, Fritz Murray, Christoph Gubler

Drafting of manuscript: Bernhard Morell, Fritz Murray

Critical revision of manuscript: Marco Bueter, Diana Vetter



## INTRODUCTION

Since 1975, the worldwide prevalence of obesity has nearly tripled [1] and is associated with substantial comorbidities and a noteworthy economic burden. Currently, laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG) and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) comprise the most efficient therapies in treating morbid obesity.

Despite the relatively low incidence of post-bariatric surgery leaks ranging between 1.5 %-4.9 % [2-5], the growing number of bariatric surgeries leads to a significant increase of complications. It is commonly recognized that revisional bariatric operations are (i) technically demanding and (ii) associated with intra- and postoperative complications thereby carrying a severalfold increased risk of mortality [6, 7].

During the last decade, interventional endoscopy has become an invaluable alternative or addition to revisional surgery. Hitherto, the endoscopic placement of self-expandable metal stents (SEMS) has been regarded as the mainstay of the endoscopic management with post bariatric leak closure of up to 88% [8]. However, stent related complications such as stent migration, local pressure necrosis, bleeding, mucosal ulcers and strictures are frequently encountered adverse events. In the management of post bariatric complications, SEMS treatment is further hampered by the frequent requirement for supplementary abscess drainage to prevent or treat sepsis. Due to the mentioned limitations, SEMS has been challenged by endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) that was first introduced for the treatment of anastomotic leakage complicating rectal resection [9, 10]. Vacuum therapy using a polyurethane foam has the ability to seal the leak, thereby decreasing bacterial contamination, promoting vascularity, and propagating the formation of granulation tissue [11, 12]. In fact, retrospective studies suggest that EVT may be superior to other treatment modalities [13-15]. In 2013 our group introduced the stent-over-sponge (SOS) treatment which combines EVT with SEMS placement [16]. In selected cases, this technique optimizes vacuum therapy by directing the vacuum force towards the defect which in our experience results in faster ingrowth of granulation tissue, thus promoting more rapid closure of the defect. Only scant literature, however, exists on EVT in bariatric patients [17, 18].

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### **Patient selection**

We herein describe the endoscopic treatment of six consecutive patients (2/6 male, median age 51.5 years, median BMI 44.3 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, median preoperative weight 133.5 kg; for detailed patient characteristics see table 1) that were treated with EVT for early postoperative anastomotic leakages after primary LSG (n=2) and RYGB (n=4) at our institution between May 2016 to May 2018. Four patients (# 1, 2, 5 and 6) were referred from other hospitals after the initial treatment of the postoperative leak had failed.

### **Endoscopic interventions**

All endoscopies were conducted with Olympus single-channel gastroscopes (Olympus Medical Systems, Tokyo, Japan). The technical aspects of the endoscopic procedures (EVT and SOS) have been previously described [16, 19]. Briefly, the initial endoscopic assessment included an approximative assessment of the dehiscence dimensions in reference to standard biopsy forceps. The placement of the Eso-SPONGE® (B. Braun Melsungen AG, Melsungen, Germany) consisting of an open-pored polyurethane sponge fitted to a gastric tube was aided by a previous endoscopic placement of an overtube provided by the manufacturer. Using the Eso-SPONGE® pusher, the foam was directly placed into the wall defect, or in case of large perforations into abscess cavities (fig. 1). In two patients the sponge placement was complicated due to angulation of the opening towards the wound cavity. Hence, the insertion had to be performed applying the “backpack-method”, i.e. the sponge was pulled in to cavity using a forceps after a suture loop was attached to the tip to the loop. After optimal placement, continuous negative pressure of 75 mmHg was applied over the sponge suction tube which was connected to a vacuum device (VAC Medela, Baar, Switzerland). In 83% of the presented cases the stent-over-sponge (SOS) technique was applied at least once as described previously by our group [16]. In brief, after insertion of the foam into the wound cavity, a partially covered SEMS (Ultraflex Esophageal NG, Boston Scientific, Marlborough, Massachusetts, USA; or Hanaro Esophagus, M.I. Tech, Pyeongtaek, South Korea) was placed over the foam in order to avoid dislodging from the correct position. The SOS technique was applied if the wall defect was considered too large to be sealed by the sponge in order to prevent muddy reflux into the cavity or in case of smaller defects, the luminal placement appeared to be ineffective. A scheme of the described endoscopic interventions is shown in figure 2. The sponge was replaced every 3-5 days in order to

prevent ingrowth of granulation tissue. Vacuum therapy was considered successful if no macroscopic evidence for a persisting dehiscence was visible after final sponge removal without subsequent need for any surgical intervention. All treatments were performed in accordance to previous institutional experiences aiming for a prospective analysis. All patients signed the written informed consent for the endoscopic treatment and consented the analysis and anonymized publication of their medical data.

## **RESULTS**

### **Patient characteristics**

We retrospectively analyzed 6 consecutive patients who were treated endoscopically at our institution for leakage in the upper gastrointestinal tract after bariatric surgery between 2016 and 2018. All treated complications were considered early occurring within a median of 3.5 postoperative days (range 3-9). In five of the six cases, diagnosis was made by computed tomography (CT). In the remaining case (1/6), a dehiscence was solely seen during diagnostic gastroscopy. In the patients undergoing LSG, as underlying defect staple line rupture was found (2/6). In case of the leaks post RYGB (4/6), anastomotic leakage was detected. The median number of days between diagnosis of the anastomotic leakage and the beginning of EVT was 2.5 days (range 1-7), resulting in a median of 7.5 days (range 4-11) after the initial bariatric surgery. All leakages or defects were located distally to the diaphragm in close proximity to the gastroesophageal junction (EGJ) with an endoscopically measured distance to the teeth ranging from 39 to 50cm. In 5/6 of the patients (83%) the leakages or staple line defects, respectively, were connected to considerably large (up to 15x15cm) infradiaphragmatic abscess cavities. Prior to EVT, a total of three patients (#3, 4 and 6) underwent surgical repair which was combined with the placement of a self-expandable metal stent (SEMS) in one case (patient #4). Another patient (#5) underwent SEMS placement along with laparoscopic lavage prior to EVT.

### **Clinical course and procedure related complications**

No therapy related severe adverse events were observed. Of note, none of the patients operated at our institution developed sepsis nor needed to be referred to the intensive care unit. In one patient (patient # 1) esophageal wall stripping occurred when the SEMS was extracted and an enlarging intraperitoneal abscess cavity with extension to the spleen had to be laparoscopically drained. In the

same patient, great care was taken that the foam was not in contact with the spleen to prevent potential splenic hemorrhage. Over the course of the prolonged hospital stay with a total of 9 sponge replacements, the patient was diagnosed with adjustment disorder, requiring psychiatric counseling. Two of the four patients that were referred to our hospital presented with secondary acute respiratory distress syndrome which required initiation of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation before referral to our institution. In one of these patients (#5), the application of Padlock Clip™ to close a fistula was ineffective after 16 sponge treatments had been performed. Subsequently, this patient underwent another 8 EVT's which finally resulted in sustained closure of the defect. The other three patients did not receive any additional interventional therapy during the course of EVT. The decision to terminate EVT was based on visual conformation of a small contained wound cavity, lined by granulation tissue (fig. 3). The median duration of EVT was 23.5 days (range 7-89) with a median number of 7 endoscopic interventions (range 1-24) conducted in a median of four days (range 3-4) in between sponge replacements. In 83.3% (5/6 patients) of the cases EVT was combined with SOS. In these five patients a median of 5.5 (3-16) SOS-replacements were performed. Representative images of the endoscopic procedures are shown in figures 1 and 2. During the course of EVT all patients received broad spectrum antibiotics.

## DISCUSSION

A leak complicating bariatric surgery represents still a life threatening situation and its management remains a major clinical challenge. The evidence published on EVT in bariatric patients, however, is extremely limited and no guidelines embrace its implementation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest case series evaluating the clinical course of bariatric patients undergoing EVT due to anastomotic or staple line leakage. The rationale to apply EVT in bariatric patients is mainly derived by the favorable outcomes observed in the treatment of leakages of various other etiologies, such as anastomotic insufficiency secondary to esophagectomy, Boerhaave's syndrome, or iatrogenic perforations [13-15]. Considering the serious instability of two of our patients (# 5 and 6), the clinical outcome of our series with no mortality, low EVT-associated morbidity and complete recovery is excellent. According to our experience, EVT may reduce the need for percutaneous drainage and serves as another argument to forgo routine use of an abdominal drain following bariatric surgery [21]. It needs to be emphasized, however, that significant EVT related complications, such as severe

hemorrhage due to eroded blood vessel [13] or dislodgement of the foam into the pharynx compromising respiration (personal observation beyond this study) occur. In addition to that, physicians need to be aware that repeat sponge replacements can lead to considerable psychological distress in affected patients. As a result, one patient undergoing 16 sponge placements over a period of 89 days developed adjustment disorder that made psychiatric counseling necessary. Whereas most publications on EVT in the upper GI tract focus on the treatment of supradiaphragmatic perforations, we herein demonstrate the feasibility of EVT distally to the diaphragm in patients with extensive defects. By using the “backpack method”, overtube length did not preclude treatment of wall defects in the midgut, as they occur in anastomotic leakage of the gastrojejunostomy after RYGB.

As described above, partially covered SEMS were used instead of fully covered stents based on the rationale that the uncovered meshes of the stents may prevent migration [20]. Nonetheless, SEMS migration occurred in one patient.

Since timely treatment of postbariatric leaks is crucial, any treatment delay should be avoided. The lag between the diagnosis of the leakage and the initiation of EVT is mainly attributed to the fact that four patients (# 1, 2, 5 and 6) were referred from other hospitals. In patient #4, EVT was applied after a previous SEMS treatment over a period of 7 days did not result in clinical improvement.

Undeniably, our study has some limitations. The successful treatment of a limited number of cases does not rule out potential treatment failures. Additionally, the question of how to combine the various treatment modalities in the management of postbariatric leaks remains unsolved. Since repeat inpatient endoscopies are required during EVT, expenditures are of major concern, especially when combined with the SOS-principle. As mentioned above, SEMS placement represents another effective treatment option [20, 22, 23] with the potential advantage of i) fewer endoscopies and ii) outpatient treatment. Relating to the data published by Murino et al. [20] reporting on the outcome for 91 postbariatric patients, 74 patients could be successfully treated by SEMS application, thereof 36 were treated by a single SEMS placement. However, it needs to be emphasized that clinical success rate in the cited studies is less than 90% and treatment failure likely results in prolonged hospital stay generating additional costs. Therefore, the evaluation of other treatment modalities such as EVT appears to be justified. The significant costs generated by the application of the SOS-principle, however, should be carefully balanced against their potential benefits. To make an example, in patient # 5 requiring 16 SEMS-placements additional costs of approximately 40'000 Swiss francs were

generated. It needs to be mentioned, however, that same patient was critically ill needing treatment on ICU for 40 days.

We applied therefore the SOS-principle only when the clinical condition of the patient required aggressive treatment and either a mismatch between the size of the leak, the luminal diameter and the size of the sponge was postulated or the defect was too large to be sealed by the sponge. By using the SOS-method in turn, ineffective application of EVT could be reliably prevented.

Taking the various arguments together, EVT may be regarded as an effective alternative to SEMS placement in patients with large wound cavities that are amenable to sponge placement whereas the SOS principle should be reserved for severely ill patients in whom sponge dislodgement is a major concern. Prospective studies are paramount to further elucidate the issue of cost-effectiveness, since growing number of post-bariatric patients call for resource-sparing treatment algorithms that offer guidance in the choice of the optimal treatment strategy in relation to specific patient characteristics. Of note, pathophysiology and course of illness in patients with postbariatric leakage depend to some extent on the type of bariatric surgery. Leaks in patients undergoing LSG are usually located at the angle of His and their treatment may be more time consuming [20, 24] because the sleeved stomach represents a high pressure system due to sphincters at both ends. Whereas the limited number of patients in our case series does not allow any conclusions to be drawn concerning this matter, trials evaluating EVT compared to transpyloric SEMS-treatment in patients with leaks at the angle of His would be of great interest.

Finally, the role of endoscopic internal drainage (EID) by inserting pigtailed into collections compared to EVT or SEMS treatment has not yet been defined. With respect to EVT, EID may be better tolerated and offers the advantage of outpatient treatment.

## **CONCLUSION**

In summary, EVT is an effective and safe treatment for staple line or anastomotic leakage after bariatric surgeries and can be adopted for the treatment of midgut defects. Further studies with a greater number of patients comparing surgical drainage alone or in combination with EVT versus EVT alone are needed.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards:**

We (the authors) have nothing to disclose. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

## REFERENCES:

1. WHO. Obesity and overweight, World Health Organisation Factsheet. 2017.  
<http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight>. Accessed 15.08.2018
2. Almahmeed T, Gonzalez R, Nelson LG, Haines K, Gallagher SF, Murr MM (2007) Morbidity of anastomotic leaks in patients undergoing Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. *Arch Surg* 142(10):954-7.
3. Aurora AR, Khaitan L, Saber AA (2012) Sleeve gastrectomy and the risk of leak: a systematic analysis of 4,888 patients. *Surg Endosc* 26(6):1509-15.
4. Ballesta C, Berindoague R, Cabrera M, Palau M, Gonzales M (2008) Management of anastomotic leaks after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. *Obes Surg* 18(6):623-30.
5. Sakran N, Goitein D, Raziel A, Keidar A, Beglaibter N, Grinbaum R, Matter I, Alfici R, Mahajna A, Waksman I, Shimonov M, Assalia A (2013) Gastric leaks after sleeve gastrectomy: a multicenter experience with 2,834 patients. *Surg Endosc* 27(1):240-5.
6. Nandipati K, Lin E, Husain F, Perez S, Srinivasan J, Sweeney JF, Davis SS (2013) Factors predicting the increased risk for return to the operating room in bariatric patients: a NSQIP database study. *Surg Endosc* 27(4):1172-7.
7. Gribben JL, Ilonzo N, Neifert S, Michael Leitman I (2018) Predictors of Reoperation and Failure to Rescue in Bariatric Surgery. *JLS* 22(1).
8. Puli SR, Spofford IS, Thompson CC (2012) Use of self-expandable stents in the treatment of bariatric surgery leaks: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc* 75(2):287-93.
9. Weidenhagen R, Gruetzner KU, Wiecken T, Spelsberg F, Jauch KW (2008) Endoscopic vacuum-assisted closure of anastomotic leakage following anterior resection of the rectum: a new method. *Surg Endosc* 22(8):1818-25.
10. Weidenhagen R, Gruetzner KU, Wiecken T, Spelsberg F, Jauch KW (2008) Endoluminal vacuum therapy for the treatment of anastomotic leakage after anterior rectal resection. *Rozhl Chir* 87(8):397-402.
11. Argenta LC, Morykwas MJ (1997) Vacuum-assisted closure: a new method for wound control and treatment: clinical experience. *Ann Plast Surg* 38(6):563-76; discussion 77.
12. Morykwas MJ, Argenta LC, Shelton-Brown EI, McGuirt W (1997) Vacuum-assisted closure: a new method for wound control and treatment: animal studies and basic foundation. *Ann Plast Surg* 38(6):553-62.



13. Laukoetter MG, Mennigen R, Neumann PA, Dhayat S, Horst G, Palmes D, Senninger N, Vowinkel T (2017) Successful closure of defects in the upper gastrointestinal tract by endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT): a prospective cohort study. *Surg Endosc* 31(6):2687-96.
14. Brangewitz M, Voigtlander T, Helfritz FA, Lankisch TO, Winkler M, Klempnauer J, Manns MP, Schneider AS, Wedemeyer J (2013) Endoscopic closure of esophageal intrathoracic leaks: stent versus endoscopic vacuum-assisted closure, a retrospective analysis. *Endoscopy* 45(6):433-8.
15. Schniewind B, Schafmayer C, Voehrs G, Egberts J, von Schoenfels W, Rose T, Kurdow R, Arlt A, Ellrichmann M, Jurgensen C, Schreiber S, Becker T, Hampe J (2013) Endoscopic endoluminal vacuum therapy is superior to other regimens in managing anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy: a comparative retrospective study. *Surg Endosc* 27(10):3883-90.
16. Gubler C, Schneider PM, Bauerfeind P (2013) Complex anastomotic leaks following esophageal resections: the new stent over sponge (SOS) approach. *Dis Esophagus* 26(6):598-602.
17. Schmidt F, Mennigen R, Vowinkel T, Neumann PA, Senninger N, Palmes D, Laukoetter MG (2017) Endoscopic Vacuum Therapy (EVT)-a New Concept for Complication Management in Bariatric Surgery. *Obes Surg* 27(9):2499-505.
18. Seyfried F, Reimer S, Miras AD, Kenn W, Germer CT, Scheurlen M, Jurowich C (2013) Successful treatment of a gastric leak after bariatric surgery using endoluminal vacuum therapy. *Endoscopy* 45 Suppl 2 UCTN:E267-8.
19. Valli PV, Mertens JC, Kroger A, Gubler C, Gutschow C, Schneider PM, Bauerfeind P (2018) Stent-over-sponge (SOS): a novel technique complementing endosponge therapy for foregut leaks and perforations. *Endoscopy* 50(2):148-53.
20. Murino A, Arvanitakis M, Le Moine O, Blero D, Deviere J, Eisendrath P (2015) Effectiveness of Endoscopic Management Using Self-Expandable Metal Stents in a Large Cohort of Patients with Post-bariatric Leaks. *Obes Surg* 25(9):1569-76.
21. Gundogan E, Kayaalp C, Aktas A, Saglam K, Sansal M, Gokler C, Cicek E, Uylas U, Sumer F (2018) Influence of Drain Placement on Postoperative Pain Following Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass for Morbid Obesity: Randomized Controlled Trial. *Obes Surg*.
22. van Boeckel PG, Sijbring A, Vleggaar FP, Siersema PD (2011) Systematic review: temporary stent placement for benign rupture or anastomotic leak of the oesophagus. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 33(12):1292-301.

23. Boerlage TCC, Houben GPM, Groenen MJM, van der Linde K, van de Laar A, Emous M, Fockens P, Voermans RP (2018) A novel fully covered double-bump stent for staple line leaks after bariatric surgery: a retrospective analysis. *Surg Endosc* 32(7):3174-80.
24. Eisendrath P, Cremer M, Himpens J, Cadiere GB, Le Moine O, Deviere J (2007) Endotherapy including temporary stenting of fistulas of the upper gastrointestinal tract after laparoscopic bariatric surgery. *Endoscopy* 39(7):625-30.

**Table 1:** Patient characteristics

Patient	Sex; Age [years]	Type bariatric surgery	Size and type of wall defect and abscess cavity	BMI [kg/m <sup>2</sup> ]	Number of postoperative days until diagnosis of leakage	Days from diagnosis of leakage until EVT	Type first-line treatment, if any	Number of endoscopies (= number of endosponge placements)	Median number of days between sponge exchanges	Number of SEMS implantations	Median number of days between SEMS exchanges	Total duration of EVT [days]	Additional interventional therapy during EVT	Duration of hospitalization (duration of stay on IMC/ICU) [days]	Therapeutic success
1	female; 51	LSG	2x1cm dehiscence, 10cm deep intraperitoneal abscess cavity	48	3	1	none	9	4	6	4	39	laparoscopic lavage due to enlarging infradiaphragmatic abscess cavity 11 days after start of EVT	52 (1/0)	yes
2	female; 60	RYGB	1.5x1cm dehiscence, 5-cm deep abscess cavity	48.9	3	4	none	7	4	5	4	24	no	42 (1/0)	yes
3	male; 54	RVGB	1x0.5cm dehiscence, 2 cm deep cavity	40.6	9	1	surgical repair	1	4	0		7	no	30 (0/2)	yes
4	female; 29	RYGB	1.5x1.5cm dehiscence, no cavity	44.3	3	7	surgical repair + SEMS	3	4	3	4	12	no	22 (0/0)	yes
5	male; 48	LSG	3x3cm dehiscence, 15x15cm abscess cavity	42.2	5	6	laparoscopic lavage and drainage + 2 SEMSs	24	3	16	3	89	ECMO due to severe secondary ARDS with multiple organ failure; unsuccessful attempt to close fistula with Padlock-Clip	71 (0/40)	yes
6	female; 52	RYGB	3x3cm dehiscence, 5x5cm abscess cavity, fistula to remaining stomach	41.3	4	1	surgical repair + drainage of abscess	7	3	6	3	23	ECMO due to severe secondary ARDS	22 (7/10)	yes

**Abbreviations:** LSG = laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy; RYGB = Roux-en-Y gastric bypass; EVT = endoscopic vacuum therapy; SEMS = self-expandable metal stent; IMC = intermediate care unit; ICU = intensive care unit; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; ARDS = acute respiratory distress syndrome

## Figure legends

### Figure 1:

**Fig 1** Initial situation patient #1. **a** initial dehiscence (gastroscopy #1). **b** enlarged dehiscence with visualization of spleen (gastroscopy #4, 11 days after initial EVT). **c** exemplary CT image showing large fluid collection with entrapped air. **d** esosponge in defect (gastroscopy #6, 18 days after initial EVT)

### Figure 2:

**Fig 2** Endoscopic vacuum therapy (EVT) as performed in patient # 1. **a** EVT was initially applied intracavitary. **b** Care was taken to avoid any contact with the spleen (exemplified by the red line). As the cavity diminished in size, the stent-over- sponge (SOS) method was used.

### Figure 3:

**Fig 3** Course of treatment patient #1. **a** Formation of granulation tissue with esosponge in situ (gastroscopy #7 24 days after initial EVT). **b** stent-over-sponge (gastroscopy #7, 24 days after initial EVT). **c** Granulation tissue in former cavity (gastroscopy #9, 31 days after initial EVT). **d** Final visualization of initial dehiscence with healed mucosa (gastroscopy #12, 40 days after initial EVT)

## Figures

Fig 1





Fig 2



**Fig 3**






Table 1: Patient characteristics

Patient	Sex; Age [years]	Type bariatric surgery	Size and type of wall defect and abscess cavity	BMI [kg/m²]	Number of postoperative days until diagnosis of leakage	Days from diagnosis of leakage until EVT	Type first-line treatment, if any	Number of endoscopies (= number of endosponge placements)	Median number of days between sponge exchanges	Number of SEMS implantations	Median number of days between SEMS exchanges	Total duration of EVT [days]	Additional interventional therapy during EVT	Duration of hospitalization (duration of stay on IMC/ICU) [days]	Therapeutic success
1	female; 51	LSG	2x1cm dehiscence, 10cm deep intraperitoneal abscess cavity	48	3	1	none	9	4	6	4	39	laparoscopic lavage due to enlarging infradiaphragmatic abscess cavity 11 days after start of EVT	52 (1/0)	yes
2	female; 60	RYGB	1.5x1cm dehiscence, 5-cm deep abscess cavity	48.9	3	4	none	7	4	5	4	24	no	42 (1/0)	yes
3	male; 54	RVGB	1x0.5cm dehiscence, 2 cm deep cavity	40.6	9	1	surgical repair	1	4	0		7	no	30 (0/2)	yes
4	female; 29	RYGB	1.5x1.5cm dehiscence, no cavity	44.3	3	7	surgical repair + SEMS	3	4	3	4	12	no	22 (0/0)	yes
5	male; 48	LSG	3x3cm dehiscence, 15x15cm abscess cavity	42.2	5	6	laparoscopic lavage and drainage + 2 SEMSs	24	3	16	3	89	ECMO due to severe secondary ARDS with multiple organ failure; unsuccessful attempt to close fistula with Padlock-Clip	71 (0/40)	yes
6	female; 52	RYGB	3x3cm dehiscence, 5x5cm abscess cavity, fistula to remaining stomach	41.3	4	1	surgical repair + drainage of abscess	7	3	6	3	23	ECMO due to severe secondary ARDS	22 (7/10)	yes

**Abbreviations:** LSG = laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy; RYGB = Roux-en-Y gastric bypass; EVT = endoscopic vacuum thearpy; SEMS = self-expandable metal stent; IMC = intermediate care unit; ICU = intensive care unit; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; ARDS = acute respiratory distress syndrom